

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 CHRISTIAN WALKER, as Guardian Ad  
8 Litem of S.W., I.W., and T.W.,  
9 Plaintiff,  
10 v.  
11 TAP AIR PORTUGAL,  
12 Defendant.

Case No. 24-cv-06226-MMC

**ORDER RE: DEFENDANT'S MOTION  
TO DISMISS; DIRECTING  
DEFENDANT TO SUPPLEMENT  
RECORD; VACATING HEARING**

13 Before the Court is defendant Transportes Aereos Portugueses, S.A.'s<sup>1</sup> Motion to  
14 Dismiss, filed September 11, 2024, whereby it seeks dismissal of the claims asserted in  
15 plaintiff's First Amended Complaint ("FAC"). Plaintiff Christian Walker, who is the mother  
16 and guardian ad litem of three minor children plaintiffs, has not filed opposition.<sup>2</sup> Having  
17 read and considered the papers filed in support of the motion, the Court, for the reasons  
18 stated below, will afford defendant an opportunity to supplement the record and plaintiffs  
19 an opportunity to respond to any such supplementation.

20 Where, as here, "international passengers seek[ ] damages against an airline  
21 carrier,"<sup>3</sup> the claims are governed "exclusive[ly]" by the terms of the "Montreal  
22

---

23 <sup>1</sup> Said defendant asserts it has been incorrectly sued as "TAP Air Portugal."

24  
25 <sup>2</sup> Under the Local Rules of this District, any opposition or response was due no  
26 later than September 25, 2024. See Civil L.R. 7-3(a)-(b) (providing opposition to motion  
must be filed "not more than 14 days after the motion was filed").

27 <sup>3</sup> Plaintiffs' claims arise from an alleged personal injury incurred by minor S.W.  
28 while the minor was, along with her mother and two siblings, a passenger on an  
international flight en route from Portugal to the United States.

1 Convention." See Narayanan v. British Airlines, 747 F.3d 1125, 1127 (9th Cir. 2016).  
2 Under the Montreal Convention, "[t]he right to damages shall be extinguished if an action  
3 is not brought within a period of two years, reckoned from the date of arrival at the  
4 destination . . .." See id. (quoting Montreal Convention art. 35(a); emphasis in original).)

5 Plaintiffs allege that the international flight on which the injuries were incurred  
6 arrived at the scheduled destination on August 19, 2019. (See FAC ¶ 8, 11, 14.)  
7 Defendant argues the claims are barred by the above-quoted provision in the Montreal  
8 Convention, for the asserted reason that plaintiffs filed the initial complaint in state court  
9 on January 11, 2024, i.e., a date significantly more than two years after the date on which  
10 the flight arrived at its destination. Defendant, however, has not supported the instant  
11 motion with a copy of the initial complaint, and the initial complaint is not otherwise in the  
12 record.<sup>4</sup>

13 Under such circumstances, defendant is hereby DIRECTED to supplement the  
14 record by filing, no later than October 4, 2024, a copy of the initial complaint. See 28  
15 U.S.C. § 1447(b) (providing district court "may require the removing party to file with its  
16 clerk copies of all records and proceedings in [the] State court"). Plaintiffs may, no later  
17 than October 11, 2024, file a response to any such supplement. As of October 11, 2024,  
18 the Court will take the matter under submission.<sup>5</sup>

19 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

20  
21 Dated: September 27, 2024

  
22 MAXINE M. CHESNEY  
23 United States District Judge

24  
25  
26 <sup>4</sup> When it removed the instant action from state court, defendant attached thereto  
27 the FAC, the pleading with which defendant states it was served.

28 <sup>5</sup> The hearing scheduled for October 18, 2024, is hereby VACATED.